

leather bracelet, which they continue to wear until, it is said, they give it to the first man who wins their favor. They knit shirts out of twine or in double thickness, very closely knit and yet elastic, which look like coats of mail and have no sleeves, and are garnished in various patterns with pieces of clam shell. These shirts are particularly useful [181] in their fights and as protection against the thorns of the forest, but the Indians have only a few of them. 291
[301]

Other ornaments are made of feathers, especially of the ostrich [rhea--Translator], with which the women deck their foreheads, waists, shoulders, wrists and ankles. The men put on much the same gear when they are about to fight, go to feasts or to treat a sick person, as will later be shown. 301

The women themselves also weave the wool gathered from the few sheep they possess and arrange the natural wool colors in regular patterns of stripes or squares. They do not know how to make more ornamental figures. 286
[531]
[231]

In order to weave they stick four forked pieces of wood into the ground in the form of a rectangle, place a pole across each end to which they affix the warp threads and with a wooden blade about a hand breadth long thread and tamp the wool into place.

They call "weaving" potzin; the "loom" noccaléi, and the "threads" huoléi. These words, which have not the least affinity with the corresponding Spanish words, assure us that the Indians did not learn weaving from the Spaniards -- not that one should lay great stock either by similarities or by the lack of them in words to buttress a judgment of this nature (on the contrary, it happens that the Mataco always do all they can to keep from adopting foreign words to express new things, preferring to use their own words with small changes) but the fact of the matter is that we are not here confronted by one of these circumlocutions. Another possible cause for error might be found in the great difficulty which they have to pronounce words as we do. Furthermore there is the habit of taking Spanish words and modifying them to suit their own language as when they make from "cabra" [goat--Translator] caila, and from Pedro, Peiló. 192 ●

All work having to do with carrying, making tents, making pots, cooking, weaving, looking for roots and making nets, is women's work. Hunting, fishing, the making of weapons, warring, are men's business. Looking for honey in the forests, where it is abundant, and collecting fruit are activities common to both sexes. I suppose that 222
462

Chaco Indians SK4

"moon" (i-que-lacq). In this they agree with the languages of all nations, a thing which is still preserved amongst us in poetic usage, while the common language of prose has undergone such changes with the passage of time that the words no longer appear to have their primitive material significance of sun and moon. M 805

Either by analogy from "moon" to "a light" or vice versa, the fact is that the word for both "moon" and "a light" is the same. M

This is not true of the word for "fire," for to this element special properties are attributed as the Chiriguano condemn the bodies of those who die in the odor, or rather, taste, of evil, to be burned; and the Tobas and Matacos burn all bodies. This practice among the two latter nations is to be explained by their desire to hasten as much as possible the final condition which will benefit the deceased, that is, that as soon as the fleshy parts are consumed the soul will be able to descend into the earth and be among its companions. C 764

[213] Despite the fact that they are innocent of matches and sulfur, not to mention steel for striking fire, since they have no flint, they can produce fire at will. I have already described the manner in which they do this, by twirling one stick rapidly upon another which is lying on the ground until the sawdust which results -- which looks like finely powdered roasted coffee grounds -- begins to glow. Then they heap a kind of highly combustible wood onto it, blow it until a flame appears and from this they can make as large a fire as they wish. One of the two sticks which they use is from the chilca bush, which is aromatic, resinous and porous and is found in abundance throughout the Argentine Republic. M 372

It is customary to say that each Indian does everything for himself, and that this is the cause for his slowness and backwardness. But this is not so. They may be wanderers, but they do not for this reason refrain from a certain distribution of labor. There are amongst them weapon makers, canoe builders, net makers, weavers, etc., who sell their manufactured goods to their companions and receive others in exchange for them. They have, then, their guilds of arts and skills, but in an embryonic stage, of course. They also have particular terms to express themselves in this field, which in Mataco are formed from the word which indicates an object plus a particle indicative of function. Of these particles 'hi M 463

M indicates "possession" or "deposit"; guu indicates "make," "maker";
 192 kiá is "means," that is that which is used to procure something.
 463 for example: "fish" is yacq-set; "fisherman," yacq-set-quiá;
 "arrow" is luték; "arrow maker" lutek-guu; "arrow owner,"
lutek-³hi. By virtue of this same particle, the first time they saw
 a trunk and a bird cage they called them, and still call them,
imai-hi, that is, "clothes keeper"; huen-tié-hi, that is, "bird
 keeper."

M One of the more advanced industries is that of weaving for
 286 which, as I have already reported, they do not use a shuttle but
 a broad piece of wood about a hand's breadth long with which they
 press the wool by hand. Another industry is the making of nets
 M which are often as long as fifteen or twenty meters. Of all their
 415 belongings, however, nothing is superior to their bags, which are
 elegant and made to be very elastic. According to their contents
 these bags can stretch to an extraordinary size without the mesh's
 M opening too widely and thus allowing the objects to fall out. They
 531 habitually decorate them with patterns, mostly geometrical ones
 such as parallel lines, triangles and squares.

M The canoe making craft deserves special mention. They are
 346 made from a single trunk of the large and corklike yuchan tree
 which they hollow out roughly and then launch.

M The tools which those savages use are the shells of a kind of
 412 large oyster or clam which abounds in the Chaco lakes. They also
 use jaguar teeth, hard wood, and the jaws of fish such as the
 palometa, with which they shave their heads and the little hair
 which grows on their faces.

M [214] Not only are they not ignorant of the ceramic art,
 323 but it is in this one art that they most closely approach us in quality.

C Cooking must have contributed much to the discoveries of this
 M industry, but Indian piety regarding the dead is what has determined
 323 the major advances and relative progress in the art. It is precisely
 171 the Matacos, Tobas, Chunupis and others who do not bury their
 dead in ceramic vessels who have only rough, unpolished cooking
 pots, while the Indians who live in Santiago, and the Chiriguano
 of Bolivia, although they do have small imperfect jars, have
 others which are very carefully polished, painted and decorated
 with small raised nubs, in the largest and most beautiful of which
 they deposit their dead.

stemmed from the desire which the whites have of keeping the
Indians from settling and taking possession (a fact recognized by
Argentine law) of the excellent land which the local whites look
upon as legitimate prey for the future.

They do not indulge in commercial enterprises; and how could
they possibly do so when they have no agriculture or industries,
being only wanderers and nomads? However, they do practice
barter on a small scale; which is their only form of primitive,
embryonic commerce. They do not have words for "buying and
selling," and in order to express this idea it would seem that they
had gone to some of school of economics to learn the exchange
formula do ut des; for, strangely enough the Matacos, for ex-
ample, instead of saying "sell me" say atquiocq niquiocq, which
means "give me I give you."

One can gather from this that they have no form of money;
but they have invented a word to signify our coins, which is
tdócq-kynat among the Matacos and which means hide or skin of
metal. Kynat is a generic word which covers all metals which do
not exist or circulate in the Chaco. It would appear from this
that it is a word invented prior to the appearance of paper money.

Nevertheless there is a sort of medium of exchange, though
in only an incipient stage, among the inhabitants of the Chaco.
It is a substance which the Indians use to paint themselves with and
which is highly valued by them even in the smallest amounts. In
Santa Cruz de la Sierra the plant which produces it is called urucú.
This paint is obtained by boiling the fruit of the urucú for twenty-
four hours, when the coloring matter floats to the top and is col-
lected and made into small pellets of varying sizes. The dye is
exuded from the skin of the fruit, which is about the size of an
orange. The fruit with a blackist skin produces a black dye, the
one with yellow skin gives an orange or red dye and the fruit
having a white skin produces a green dye. The skin on the yellow
and white varieties is about as thick as the outer covering on a
walnut. Each one of the three grows on a different kind of urucú,
all of which are plants which grow to be about as tall as a man,
with fruit about the size of a pomegranate which split open of
their own accord when they are ripe.

Although this substance is produced and made in Bolivia,
it is current among all the Chaco Indians and is used by them to

satisfying the requirements of the inquisitive, if not those of the scientist (1).

1. In this translation, as is the case in dictionaries, the Spanish alphabet has been used for the reproduction of Indian words. J. P.

A nasal intonation runs through the whole of this language. There is hardly an occasion when h, j and q at the beginning of a syllable is not pronounced nasally -- the exception being when the final consonants of the preceding syllable is lost. I have come upon this phenomenon in all the South American languages with which I have had anything to do, but in none has it been so marked as among the Matacos. It may be because I know the other languages even less than I do this one. It is to this tendency that I attribute the shift from the Spanish ending ando to the Indian anno -- for example: tomando changes to tomanno -- our European languages have not escaped this change unscathed, witness the two letters m and n of our alphabet, the sonorous en and em of French, and the strangely comic way in which everybody pronounces words of endearment addressed to little children.

Another characteristic of this language is the apparent arbitrariness of its sounds. The reader will readily be able to appreciate this by just leafing through the dictionary: there seems hardly a time when the same word is pronounced in the same way, even when spoken by the same person, and this is even worse when it forms part of a sentence. It is truly enough to drive one to despair (!) and would lead to who knows what comparisons of inferiority but that, fortunately for the Matacos, there is a complete vindication and absolute proof to the contrary in that most glorious, polyphonic, word-rich (and in this sense -- that is of arbitrariness of sounds -- similar) language: English!

Chapter IV

Of words and the manner of their formation

192
196

It is interesting and amusing to see the way in which these people form words to designate an object new to them. Observation is the supreme teacher.

142
146

[241] For example, their name for "small bell" is quiú-hút-tzét, meaning "spider belly" [no pun or connection in Spanish--Translator]; a rifle they call as our forefathers did, that is, arquebuse, that is, "fire bow" - itoj-letzej derived from itoj, "fire" and letzej, "bow"; they call "shot" "little bullets," as do the Italians, that is: c-lóquass, from c-lo meaning bullet and quass, which is a plural diminutive ending. A piece of steel for striking fire with a flint, which they had never seen before (as was true also for all the things mentioned above) they call itoj-cquia, that is, "remedy or instrument of fire," while the flint itself they called ten-thé or stone; the wick they call itoj-léss from less meaning "sheaf," "bundle," "group," "family"; the cartridge shell they call c-lo-'hi from c-lo meaning bullet and 'hi, a particle which signifies "container" or "possession"; a mirror is tope-yaj-hi, tope-yaj meaning "image," "shadow"; a sock is ecolo-búth, which is derived from ecoló, "foot" and bhút, "covering." On the other hand shoe is to them nissót or sót, which proves that they already had knowledge of it, for they may on occasion use a kind of sandal such as that worn by the country people and called usutas. They make them from a piece of hide which serves as sole and two thongs which go between the large and second toe and are tied above the ankle. Matches [fósforos in Spanish--Translator] they call as we do ítossass, a contraction of itoj-quuass, which means "little fires"; and a match box is itoj-hi-huass, that is, "keeper of little fires."

A word which has always intrigued me and whetted my curiosity regarding its etymology is yúccúas which means tobacco, a product which was not known before in the Chaco. I think that I am not mistaken when I derive it from yu or iú, meaning "burned" and cúas, which means "to chew," "break up," "grind." As coincidence will have it, in these two activities both the use and the end result of the use of tobacco are involved. Furthermore, when an Indian says "give me some burned to chew" is he not saying pretty much what we do when we ask "give me something to smoke" [dame con que fumar in Spanish means literally "give me that with which to smoke"--Translator], that is, something to make smoke with?

192
196

Another analogy in expression of thought -- in addition to those resulting from words in detail and from many other elements -- is to be found in the use of téi to designate eyes and face, similar to the poetic use amongst us present-day Italians of víso for face, from the Latin visus, which means "sight."

A door they call hlappé bhut or "door-opening coverer"; and in this I believe that they are more exact than we who lack a term as clear and precise as is this.

They use the same word huoléi for wool, hair [cabello in Spanish is limited to "hair on the scalp" -- Translator] and "hair" [pelo, that is, hair on any part of face or body other than scalp -- Translator], but precede it with a name qualifying the respective object. We do the same thing but it passes unperceived when we say cabello to signify the hair of the scalp via a syncopation which puts its etymology on the wrong track. We have a great many such misleading word shifts in our language, and the Matacos have even more [242] which makes it even more difficult to keep tabs on them.

They use the same word huoléi for the leaves of trees, thus giving one to understand that for them leaves are the hair of trees. And really they come close in this to the actual physical facts for the trees which predominate in the Chaco are of the minosa family and have leaves which are complexly and minutely subdivided, thus giving rise to the botanical term "pinnate" and "bipinnate" which are terms that justify the Mátaco name which is in such close agreement with the meaning of the scientific term pinnate [from the Latin pinna meaning feather -- Translator].

It is worthwhile mentioning the way in which they distinguish between the tree and its fruit -- this is done by means of an inflection; for example: the mistol tree is O'ho'-yucqué, its fruit is o'hóyaque; the vinal tree is attécque, its fruit attáje; the black algarrobo tree is uossot-etzáje, its fruit uossot-etzáje, and so forth.

One notices here the constant change of u to a. We do nothing different when we call the pear tree pero and its fruit pera, the apple tree manzano and its fruit manzana, and so forth. This does not mean that there are not other ways of naming these things.

family relationship, let us say, for example, a nephew, has four different names.

An equally interesting form is that used for the demonstrative pronouns, which is similar to French usage for it is composed of the pronoun toj meaning "this one" (corresponding to the French ce) and certain particles of location such as licné for "that one over there"; letti or lani for "that one"; and others, among which are tzi for "this one." This tzi is equivalent to chi and to quii and is interesting because we come upon it again in the Araucanian language. These demonstrative pronouns also have an adjectival use, and when so employed, become separated, the toj part being prefixed to the noun and the licné, tzi etc. being suffixed, these latter can then not be declined, but the former (that is, toj) is declined. Now then, does not the same thing happen with French demonstratives? For instance with ceci and cela, which in the plural form are ceux-ci, ceux-la, and become separated when applied to some other term.

And do such similarities in form not reveal a great harmony in human intelligence, the same linguistic recourses being used to express a like order of ideas in spite of the distance which separates the different races?

The following derivation deserves special mention because it is revealing of a whole order of ideas: "No" is ka, "nothing" is kiá, "nobody" is kiái; the three words keep to the same root, and in a way which is clearer and more logical than our corresponding words. Likewise we have tde meaning "no" and that meaning "nothing," these two terms used always at the end of a word or phrase.

Tell me now, what more elegant and more compactly logical does philology have to show than the manner in which the Matacos express possessing, containing, executing, or exercising a skill? The letter h (when it has an apostrophe it is to be pronounced nasally) shows up in many words, not to say all, which express possession or capacity. Now hi and huu express that which contains, he who possesses, and he who does something; huet means "house," "the place in which." For example: "fish" is yácsét, "fish pond" is yácsétte-hi; "shoes" are hissóhëss, "seller of shoes" is nissóhësse-hi, "maker of shoes" is nissóhësse-huu, and "shoe shop" is nissóhësse-huet. And in all analogous cases they use the same

constructions. In what way can it be said that they are behind other languages?

192
196

[244] Thus for Venus they employ the same verbal image as we and the Latins do, that is lucero ["morning star" --Translator] ijuála-hu, "mother of the day"; similarly they call the wrist "mother of the hand," tcuê-huo; the abispa tic-lan [Enigmatic. The closest I can get to any logical meaning is "the tic-lan wasp," which is not helpful at all --Translator] they call "mother of the tic-lan, tic-lan-huu; and the beating of the pulse is "little heart," tdul-lecuáj.

The Mataco language may be lacking in certain particular sounds (articulations) but, on the other hand, it has a superfluity of other particular sounds (articulations). Among these latter the following stand out: quiá, quié, quí, quíó, quíu, and cquiá, and so forth, which together with others of similar sound are so frequent as to leave one in some doubt as to whether the language is not made up of the same syllable repeated a thousand times over in the same sense. We know already that quiá, quié etc. can change places with tzá, tzé and so forth, or with chiá, chié, etc., or with tchiá, tchié, etc. Furthermore the inversion of the constituent elements of a word is frequent, for example: "wide" is quü-tzaj-hu and also i-tzaj-quié -- it can therefore be readily understood to what extent Indian oratory can spread itself out and expand, as far as form goes, without really saying anything different. This sort of thing must be very generalized. General Mansilla in his outstanding book Una expedición a los Indios Ranqueles ["An expedition to the Ranquel Indians" --Translator] tells of having experienced this Indian fondness for repetitiveness, and I did also among the Tobas when we were harangued for half an hour and were really only told the same thing in several different ways according to Faustino the interpreter.

192
193

In their formation of compound words they follow the English and German usage; for example: "gloves," which are handschuhe in German, that is "hand shoes," are cquíéí-pbut among the Indians, that is "hand coverers." The same thing happens in negative sentences; example: "I do not see," is Ich sehe nicht in German and nu-ihenni-tde in Mataco, that is, "I see not," which is also precisely the manner of expression of the inhabitants of the areas surrounding Milan.

R2
196

They have general terms which represent certain abstractions such as "bird," "fish," "tree," and also particular ones with which they differentiate between particular species. What is more they even have abstract nouns, for in addition to such words as "never," "always," they have others, "fear" for instance, which they call uái, a word which also means "tremor" or "trembling." For earthquake they say hunat uái, which means "earth tremble," just as in Spanish one says "tremor of the earth." Can it be therefore that for the Matacos to fear is to tremble? Is it not in this way, taking the part for the whole, that our own abstract terms came into being in the great majority of cases? Now trembling is one, the commonest, of the many outward manifestations of fear.

I affirm that these Indians are in full possession of the human intellectual faculties and ability to judge rationally, and these developed to such a degree that they can be considered our equals both in their way of reasoning and in their antiquity. The gap which exists between them and us is one which exists only in the actual world of facts and of the ideas which refer to [245] those facts -- a gap which is in no way proportional to that which exists between their intellectual faculties and ours. And this is easily understood. 151

How many years have gone by, how many were and how many are the individuals amongst us who have taken full advantage of the intellectual benefits of science, ethics and higher education generally? Very small in number are they if we take into account the historical antiquity of man and the number of men who have lived. The effects, therefore, of human physiological traits must have changed the common heritage of humanity in the whole world during the period of its limited civilizations very little, if at all. 000

The fact of not having reflected on this phenomenon is the cause behind the ignorant persons's astonishment at being confronted with the advanced conditions and relative progress to be found amongst savage peoples.

The short intellectual and moral distance which separates them from us is an eloquent testimony to the hoary antiquity of man, dating back to the separation of man from his pre-human ancestors, which dwarfs into insignificance the few years which separate us from a state of savagery akin to that in which these Indians live.

Chapter V

Augmentatives and Diminutives

Another thing which almost drove me to insanity was the nomenclature of the domestic animals which were introduced to America from Europe at the time of the discovery or conquest.

It is well known that when new things are introduced into previously unopened areas the names of these things are also introduced. It is also known that this fact has been of inestimable value, not only to philologists but also to ethnographers, that is, to those who deal with and study the distribution and description of the earth's peoples.

Very well then, -- it would happen that when I asked for the local names for horse, cow, sheep, etc., the Indians would answer with names which were absolutely different from the Spanish names.

Even now I get an urge to laugh when I remember the tortures to which I submitted the Mataco words in order to try to boil them down, by dint of hypothetical changes and shifts, to their Spanish roots.

I was fortunate enough one day to catch two pigeons in a trap.

We had on board with us a beautiful bulldog. In Mataco the word for dog is sinoj, and we had named our dog Palomo ["pigeon"--Translator], which the Matacos [246] literally translated into their own language as ucquinataj. One day it happened that an Indian, on patting the dog, said, by way of expressing his admiration: Sinoj-táj! instead of Sinoj or Ucquinatáj. I started then to realize that the particle taj expressed size of superiority, that it was a loose or floating affix, and that it could be added to or taken from other words in order to modify their meaning. I flew to my note books, leafed through the pages, ran through my lists of nouns, added taj to those which did not have it, and in an instant there sprang up before my eyes, to my immense satisfaction, the true, beautiful, philosophic, scientific etymologies of my quiuiasse-táj, "cow"; yelatáj, horse; chíonataj, "sheep"; quiuiasset, "deer"; yeláj, "tapir"; chionaj, "doe" -- with the famous taj which enlarges, ennobles and stretches them and declares them to be superior.

192
183

So it was that it suddenly dawned on me that in those words, which I had jotted down in their scores, and which ended in taj, I must eliminate that syllable, as also the famous uu or a or la, and tune my ear and sharpen my eye for the sounds which were basic and essential to each word. At the same time that I started to see this more clearly, I began to discover the genesis and the laws governing the word changes.

From there on a new region began to open up for me into which I readily and happily entered.

I hope that the reader will not become scandalized at this sort of enthusiasm which he may perceive in me. In my position he might well have experienced the same thing, for man is a slave to circumstances -- any Minister of State who becomes for a while a private soldier will take pleasure in noticing the look of approval from his corporal for a well executed "present arms"; as will the philosopher when praised by his lady for having helped her to untangle her skein of wool.

So how could a nobody such as I not feel pleasure on seeing, in his own hands, so to speak, a language which had been considered impoverished and of no account, take shape and flower into a methodical and elegant tongue?

Well, anyway -- these Matacos have an augmentative particle: taj, which is used to indicate physical, "moral" and descriptive qualities. So from icnú, man, they form icnú-taj, large man, from inót, "water," they form inót-táj "fire water" or brandy, and from ahló, pole or rod, they form ahlotáj-yacaré, "almost pole" or "nearly pole."

As a diminutive they sometimes use the particle quúáj and quíáj; for example: from coló, foot, they derive coló-quuáj, little foot; from cuéi, hand, they make cuéi-quíáj, little hand. They also use this latter term to indicate a person who is either lacking a hand -- or the whole arm -- or has a severe malformation in it. [The word "manco" in Spanish means any one of these--Translator.] So a chief called Manco in Spanish -- he actually lacked a hand -- was called in Mataco Cuéi-quuáj. This diminutive particle is also added to pronouns, a thing which cannot be done in Italian but can in Spanish, to wit: esa - esita ["That (feminine) one" -- "that little (feminine) one"--Translator] -- which is very frequently used by country people.

These suffixes taj and quauj and quiaj, although they are well defined particles, may nevertheless, and probably ought to, be considered as [247] inflections, for they mean nothing by themselves and furthermore it is they which are declined and not the words to which they are attached (1). And it is worth noting that

1. I find in my notes that taj is sometimes a shortened form of oitaj, meaning "almost."

in the matter of declension they follow a rule quite contrary to the one used for the suffixes corresponding to demonstrative pronouns; the same phenomenon which is encountered in French and Italian diminutives. Taj and quiaj, of which the plurals are tass and quiáss, divide and separate as do the demonstratives, for example: "box of matches" is itoj-hi-cuass, that is "fire-box-little"; a case of incorporation (2).

2. In Mataco, "matches" is translated as "little fires," itoj-huaj (euphonic h in place of c), thus following our usage even in this detail.

Finally, it seems that they habitually place an i in front of a foreign word. For example the Spanish nato ["snub nose"--Translator] becomes inato, in which they coincide with the Mocoví Indians. It may be just a simple euphonic exigency.

Chapter VI

Some curious cases of onomatopoea and sound similarities.

Only very few words in this Indian language can be considered onomatopoetic, that is, imitative of the sounds they express. Which phenomenon of sound imitation is considered by some to be the origin of human language, developed later by man's intelligence.

To shout or yell is ôhn; lightning is jlepp; dumb or mute is huó-huó; cough is cacojtáss; cricket is li-tzil; parrot is quie-quie

and pelican [sic.], commonly called chajá ["Crested screamer" R2
 is W. H. Hudson's name for this large, goose sized bird--Trans- 19C
 lator] is tzá-coj, both names being derived from the bird's call.
 Many other words are to be found similar to these.

Following I shall set down a few Mataco words which are
 similar in sound to those found in Old World languages.

Si["yes"--Translator] in Mataco is hié, in English "yes," in
 German ya, and in Italian gia. "No" in Mataco is ka, in the Tuscan
 dialect of Italian cke, and kein ("nobody") in German. "Son" is
tzé or ssé in Mataco, tze in Bohemian, tzae tze in Chinese.
Enfermo ["ill"--Translator] is iell or yell in Mataco, "ill" in Eng-
 lish. "For" is op in Mataco, ob in Latin--it may be added that p
 and b are interchangeable in all languages with the greatest of
 ease. "Countryside" or "field" is ajlú in Mataco, agro in Latin
 and Italian -- let it be remembered that the Matacos use l in
 place of r, so that ajlú takes the place of ajrú -- "dog" is sinoj
 in Mataco, cynos in Greek. The next few words contain similar
 letters in inverted order such as in the previously mentioned
 "melon" - nelom: "rooster" is huh or kuh in Mataco, coq in French;
 "cricket" is li-tzil in Mataco, zillo in Tuscan; casa ["house"--
 Translator] is hauet in Mataco, haus in German, [248] "house"
 in English, and huasi in Quichua; con ["with"--Translator] is uuitd
 in Mataco, "with" in English; "and" is ut-cuei in Mataco, atque
 in Latin.

Furthermore, and as an additional point of interest, I must
 say that there is, in Chinese, a superabundance of the syllables
tziá, tzié, etc., schia, schie, (sch to be pronounced as is the
 Catalonian x), tzá, tzé, etc., as also ttai or tai, which mean
 "big"; and lo, the meaning of which is still unknown to me but
 which I repeatedly come across at the end of words. This fact,
 combined with its pronunciation, which is practically identical
 to Mataco pronunciation, merits serious reflection on the part of
 the linguist, not because of any real relationship but as a
 phenomenon of concurrence.

Chapter VII

Gender, Number, case, syncopation. Article?

K2
K3

a. Gender

It does not seem to me that the nouns have gender -- only in pronouns and in demonstrative adjectives are there to be found certain changes which make me suspect a gender differentiation. Yet this goes no further than the merest suspicion.

Withal, they do suffix the ending tziná to the names of female animals, which means "female," and, when used alone and not attached to another word, means "woman"; for example, "mare" is yélaiaj-tziná. In order to indicate a male animal they usually add asnáj, which actually means "male."

b. Number

I was so sure that these inhabitants of the Chaco must possess a plural formed by the joining or placing in close proximity of some word indicative of the concept of plurality, such as "much" or some other like word, that I was for ever in search of it. Actually there was nothing unnatural about such an idea -- the Guaraní Indians do in fact use such a linguistic device, heta, which placed beside a singular immediately imparts plurality to it; the Quichuas also do likewise by suffixing cuna, and these two nations of Indians are or were neighbors of the Matacos. Many other peoples use the self same artifice which is called agglutination; the Akka of Africa do so too.

It seemed therefore quite natural that the smaller should follow in the footsteps of the larger. Furthermore, is it not often stated that agglutination is common to the less advanced languages?

[249] It is a fact that in this case also it would seem as if the peoples who utilize this recourse are the least advanced -- actually this is very far from the truth.

In short, every language system has its weak points, which nevertheless do not detract from their basic usefulness among those who utilize it. It was therefore proper for me to accept this

linguistic canon as a sort of maxim.

However, the answers to my questions in which plurals were used were anything but satisfactory. Sometimes the plural of a word would end in one way, then another plural would end differently, and in all plurals there could be inserted a ntocq, meaning "much." What is more, just as all the rest of the expression varied, so also did one remain in the dark regarding the element connoting plurality. I would formulate my questions with numbers and the doubt still remained. For example: "Two horses?" I would ask, and the answer would come "horses two"; "two men?" "two icnú, icnul, or icnuil." They appeared to be endings with different variations due to changes in pronunciation rather than to any other cause.

I repeat all this because it may be of some service to any of the many travelers who enjoy spending time among savages, either in Africa or in America. If they are not already too proud of their own knowledge and acumen it may stand them in good stead.

Meanwhile, I was surprised to gather that "we" and "you" [vosotros is 2nd person plural in familiar address--Translator] were formed directly from the singulars "I" and "thou" [tú, is 2nd person singular in familiar address--Translator] by means of the same affix. Thus, from noj-lám, meaning "I," noj-lám-il, "we," is derived; from am -- meaning "thou," they form am-il, meaning "you" [2nd person plural--Translator] -- but in this case it was a matter only of those pronouns in which there are many rule exceptions. Nevertheless this very thing, by calling my attention to a given case, gave me the key to the riddle.

These Matacos not only have a plural which they form with ntocq -- "much," but also possess others which are arrived at in different ways and by means of assorted inflections. To sum up, they have divers declensions which are exclusive of each other and which hold, in a general way, to the following rules:

Words ending in either o or velar e add i to make the plural. Thus colo, meaning "foot," becomes coloi, "feet"; huentié, "little bird," becomes huentiéi, "little birds." Words ending in aj change j to ss -- in this category fall all the augmentatives ending in taj and all diminutives ending in quiaj, for

example: igñela -- "moon" or "month," becomes igñelass, "months"; yelataj -- "horse," becomes yelatass, "horses." Words ending in u take an l, which is pronounced by pressing part of the tongue against the palate and sounds like il, for example: cannú, meaning needle, becomes cannúl, almost cannuil, "needles." Words ending in t, oj and other letters take ess for the plural; thus: yápsset, "fish," becomes yápssetéss, "fishes"; tdoj, "hide or skin," becomes tdojess, "hides." Words ending in l often add ess [sic.], sometimes losing the final l in the process; example: tzel, "belly," [250] tzeliss, "bellies"; yel meaning "a sick person" becomes yiss (or yéliss), "sick persons" -- this last being a fine example of shift.

Many exceptions have their place here too, of course, and probably other rules, but they are not included here so as to avoid becoming burdensome.

I am almost willing to believe that they have a dual approach to plurality as have the Araucano and Guaraní Indians, and the Greeks in Europe, but I cannot give any real assurance of it. To this effect I site from my notes: cqñéí -- the hand, cquéyai, both hands; noj-lamil -- we, noj-lamáss, we two; amil you [2nd person plural familiar -- Translator], amass, you two. I repeat, however, that I am not sure but that it is a duplicated plural form.

As far as numerals go they can use, or not, as they see fit, a plural for following nouns, in which case use of a plural is, so to speak, redundant. Adjectives they do not pluralize, and they place them before nouns.

c. Case

I have not come across enough examples to allow me to affirm that this language has case declension unless one wishes to construe as such the genitive suffix ca. Here is an example of the use of this suffix: Peilo-ca-Uicquii, which means "Pedro's people." Their use of postpositions (corresponding to our prepositions) can be considered as cases.

In spite of this I must give fair warning that the personal pronouns "I" and "thou," at least in the singular, have case declension, while toj, meaning "this one" seems only to have an accusative toja.

192
193

The declension of those pronouns which I have been able to glean are as follows:

R2
193

Singular

Nom. I: nojlam, nu, no'ni.
Gen. of me: noj-ca
Dat. To me: nú-ho
Ac. Me: nuy-a or nu
Ablat. With me: nuy-ej

Singular

Nom. Thou: am, or ham, and a
Gen. Of thee: aj-cá
Dat. To thee: ám-u or hám-u
Ac. Thee: ám-a and a-i
Ablat. With thee: ám-ej or ám-quie.

Plural

Nom. We: noj, lam-il, na or inat
Nom. [sic.] Us: noj, lam-áss
and in-namáss

Plural

Nom. You [familiar]: am-il or a
Nom. [sic.] You [familiar]:
am-ass, or á

It is my opinion that the ending l and il must be some degeneration of the word el, which means "other" and which was originally used to express the plural, which plural is therefore [251] nothing else than a forgotten agglutinative form which has evolved by means of progressive alterations.

d. Syncopation

Syncopation is very common in this language, doubtless for reasons of euphony, but the alteration and confusion it brings about in words give rise to many errors and make the study of the language very difficult. For example: "Do you love me?" is Yajámín nuya, which is a shortened form of yaj-a-hemin nuya. "I do not love you" is Namahemin, which comes from Nu-am-a-hemin. I myself, shortly before writing these lines, thought that nam must mean "no," which then threw me into confusion because in this present example I could not find the particle nu.

192
193

expressive of the first person. Only after having checked and compared numerous sentences were my eyes opened to the real facts.

Chapter VIII

Regarding Negative Forms

The Mataco language contains a great many negatives which occupy various positions. It is curious to note their strange similarity to the Indian languages of North America spoken by nations which one would never have supposed to be related at all.

The most common of these negatives is ka, meaning "no," which can be used alone and also prefixed to adjectives thus contradicting the meaning of the word; for example: matt means "it is true," while ka-matt means "it is false." It is strange indeed that the Akkas, those so-called pygmies of Africa have this same word in their language with the same meaning "no," according to the grammatical essay of Abbot Beltrame of Verona.

Another negative particle is tdē, which is always suffixed, for example: mát -- "true"; matti-tdē, "false."

Note the extra i which is added to soften the word. These additions and eliminations of stray letters cause great difficulty and make the student of this language lose his way at every turn, despairing of ever getting to the end of his problems. Let us look at another example: nu-huen means "I have," hue-ni-tde, "I have not."

Then there is am, which is prefixed to verbs, as for example: n'am-huen, which signifies "I do not have." There also is yaj, which is both interrogative and imperative and is prefixed to verbs; it is the ne of the Latins, except for its position. Another negative particle is laja, which also means "without." Examples of the foregoing are: "Don't kill me," yaj-lon-nu; "Do you love me?", Yaj-a-hemin-nuya? "Widow" is laja-chiēcúo-ya, that is, "husbandless one."

[252]

Chapter IX

Regarding Adjectives

92
193

a. Their usage

I have now before me the tangled problem of adjectives, comparatives, superlatives, numerals, and verb flections. There is no reason to prefer one to another and so I start with the one first mentioned.

One would think that adjectives ought to be like so many isolated plant stems, growing in such a way that a mere touch of the hand would be sufficient to turn them aside in order to pass easily by. Such is not the case. There are some which have their roots and even their branches so intertwined and enmeshed that one has need of an axe to untangle them.

There are a good many adjectives which are so rooted as to make it impossible to ascertain their beginning and their end -- in fact, most of the Mataco adjectives fall into this category. There are others, though, the geneology of which is quite evident. Among these are the possessives, which are formed from pronominal roots to which the particle ca, meaning "of," (also used as a genitive postposition) and co, which must be considered as a modification of ca, has been attached. In addition to ca and co they also use lo with the same possessives, especially, or so it seems to me, with "of mine," "of thine"; thus "of mine" (nuj) is nuj-ca, nuj-co, and nuj-lo; while "of thine" is ac-co and al-lo; and "whose?" ("of whom?") is atdec-lo.

Another way of forming these adjectives is with the addition of tzaj. For example: "fear" is uái or huái and "fearful" is huain-tzaj. Another possibility is with ya, but this is really more like a present participle. Example: nu-huai-ya, means "I fearful," "that I am afraid"; acchecuoya means "that you have a wife" or "that you have a husband."

Yet another way is to place the postposition ej beside the noun. Example: "hunger" is na-in-ló; while "hungry one" is na-in lo nej; "now" is cquiá, (which literally means "fresh" or "new") and "of now," "as of now" is cquiá-vej.

And while on this subject of adjectives it is worth remarking that practically all those which express the opposite of some quality, usually of a good quality, are made up of the adjective denoting that quality plus a negative particle which either precedes or follows it. Thus, for example: "true" is matt, and "false," ka-matt or mattildé, that is to say "not true." "Good" and "pretty" or "nice" are hiss and tzi, while "ugly" is kat-zia and tzitdé; "far" is tocuery, "near," tocuei-tde, which can also be expressed by ca-tu-ta, in which catu means "elbow" and by analogy "curve," "around the corner," and so forth.

These negative particles are also used with nouns. For example: [253] "remedy" or "cure" is ckia, while poison is ka-ckia ("no remedy," "no cure"). Do we not find the same type of usage in our own languages when we say "uncertain" for "not certain" and "discourteous" for "not courteous"?

One might say, however, that these Indians lack certain refinements of which our language can boast and which tend to soften certain expressions, as for instance the subtle distinction between "false" and "not true," "far" and "not near."

Be that as it may, they still are not lacking in other distinctions, such as that existing between "stranger" and "foreigner." The former they call ajlu-taj-jlé-lé, which means "outsider," and the latter they call ic-quiomjlé-lé, that is, "he from below." And so he is, for from the Mataco point of view foreigners live "below," downriver and off past Paraguay. Upstream from them live the whites, whom they call Chihuéle. [609]

Where did they get this word Chihuéle? Has it something to do with color? "White" is in their language pelaj, and "yellow," yaccatdé, that is, "not black," which proves that the opposite of black is for them yellow. Surely they do not consider us green or blue, however much their eyes may suffer from Daltonism. Can it be that they look upon us as red? This cannot be so either for red is icquiott, which is a far cry from Chihuéle.

The actual fact is that Chihuéle means "good looking men."

Let us study this. Chí, as we have already stated, is the same as tzí, and also the same as quí. Now tzi is a root found in ka-tzi-a and in tzitidé which mean "not good" (or "not nice") and "good not" (or "nice not"). Furthermore it is to be found in tzilataj or chilataj, meaning "good," "nice." (The local whites, by the way, mispronounce the first part of this word and say chiláta). Chilátaj is made up, in the first place, of táj which is an augmentative particle, and Chíla. In the word Chíla, the la is a particle which, as was seen in the section treating lo, ca and co, if suffixed to the root has an adjective-forming function. So it is that Chí is the root giving the basic meaning to Chílataj. Chilataj, however, means "good," "nice" to a superlative degree, so that chi is indicative of "beauty."

We have seen that c-lelé is a word which means "which is of." Now, there can be no difficulty in accepting, for a language such as this one which sacrifices so many nuances of sound, that c-lelé has become modified and changed into gúele or huéle by degeneration or because of some other shift the laws of which have not yet been discovered. Therefore Chihuéle is the same as Chic-léle, which means "those who are of the good (or nice, or goodlooking) ones," that is "The Goodlooking Ones."

I hope I may be forgiven for taking pleasure in an etymology which allows me to participate in, (although I do not deserve to) and be counted as possessing one of those four qualities declared by the Greek philosopher as indispensable for happiness, to wit: comfort, true friends, love of music and good looks [254] or to be considered so, which amounts to the same thing for all practical purposes.

Now amongst these Indians, even if one is somewhat ugly, one must yet, by comparison seem almost goodlooking, which is great -- are not these word forms therefore rational? They reveal a process of word formation by agglutination.

b. Regarding comparatives

In order to form the comparatives they use homo ehom, which means "more," together with taj, which expresses superiority.

These two words in a comparison are not joined by any equivalent to our "than" [In Spanish comparatives are formed with de or que; the foregoing "than" does not fully translate these terms--Translator.], such as in the following example: "Peter is a better boy than Paul," because they, in this case, would also say, by means of a circumlocution: "Peter is a better boy than Paul is not." This is a somewhat strange construction, but I find that it crops up repeatedly in my notes. Very often the particle ya follows the comparative, which leads me to believe that there are other comparative forms, although I have not discovered them as yet.

c. Regarding the Superlative

To form the superlative they habitually use ntócq which means "much," as is the custom in so many other tongues. They sometimes lengthen the sound of a syllable. For example: "far" is tocuéy; "very far" is tocuéey, the word being accompanied by appropriate gestures. This is also customary amongst the Araucanos and we ourselves use it in certain cases. It is quite natural and logical.

Another way of arriving at a superlative construction is by affixing a to the positive -- for instance: the comparative of the Indian word "his," which means "nice, pretty," is ha-is, "very pretty, very nice"; tocuéy, far, becomes a-tocuéy, very far.

As I have already said they have an augmentative taj and a diminutive quiaj or cuáj, particles which are suffixed and which are declinable while the noun to which they are attached remains unalterable -- their declension consists in changing j to ss for the plural.

In order to say "less" they use yaj-lom, which is the same as yaj-lehom, that is "no more," made up of the particle le plus hom; another example of agglutination, common in this type of adjective. This language is apparently extraordinarily logical, and once having started out in a given direction persists in it to the end. The problem then, in the first place, is to understand this construction, and then to keep from losing sight of it in its many twists and turns. [255]

802

gesticulations, must be a whole sentence. Even though a great deal of time has elapsed I think I can still explain them and not fall into error as I do so.

"One" is hoté-cuuj ^{hi}, and one finger is raised. One can also say hoteji and hotecoaji. Now hoté means "as," cuuj means "finger," and hi (nasal h) is a particle which indicates possession, container etc. so, not worrying too much about this small elemental difference which is so common in every language, and especially in this one which undergoes so many shifts, we may say that the translation of hotécua is: "as finger has" ("this which I show").

"Two" is hoté quuasi, and two fingers are raised. Quuas is the plural, so to speak, of cuoj according to this tongue, and thus the translation of the above is "as fingers has."

"Three" is laj tdi qua yél, and three fingers are raised, the little finger remaining folded and covered by the left hand. Now laj means "without" or "no"; el means "other"; quai is too similar to quoj to allow for doubt, and so we may say that the translation is "without the other finger." The same may be said for laja echecuoya -- "widower without a husband" [sic].

"Four" is tdi qualéss híqui and I don't know how to go about translating it literally and so shall not try. However one can perceive that in qualéss there is a plural iqui form, which is a word that often accompanies hi, and which [258] is to be found in phrases in which we have the idea of "to be" expressed, with other analogous ones -- it is therefore probable that it refers to the gestures which go with each numeral.

These gestures were not made only by that chief but also by other Indians of the central Chaco and by Faustino who could count as well as any of us. There must be some relation between the gestures and the words. The etymologies which I offer, in my opinion, explain the case more satisfactorily than those which are usually given in analogous philological problems.

However, one must not judge the worth and elegance of the original by the literal translations. Where would the elegance of most compound words be if we translated their Greek originals directly? For example; "Panorama" -- "all seen. . .!!"

And as far as the intellectual value of this manner of expressing numerals is concerned, is its genesis not quite natural? The Guarani

Indians manage by means of a similar artifice, at least with some of their numerals such as "ten" or "twenty" in place of which they say "two hands" and "two hands and two feet." And it is probable that, should we analyze the etymologies of numerals among other Indians and other nations, we would find something similar. What shall we say of Roman numerals? Do they not represent as many fingers as are needed to count up to three, and a whole hand for five (V) and a hand minus a finger for four (IV), and two superimposed hands -- one being inverted -- for the (X)? It is quite clear that Roman written numerals are to Arabic numerals what hieroglyphs are to writing and what Mataco numeral expression is to the spoken tongue.

It is precisely from nature that man must first have derived the first instruments for expressing his needs and for the development of his ideas.

Chapter XI

Pronouns and Pronominal Particles (1)

192

193

1. Interpolated chapter.

a. Personal Pronouns

The most commonly used personal pronouns are the following:

Singular	Plural
1. I - <u>no-j-lam</u>	1. We - <u>no-j-lam-il</u> ; <u>no-j-lam-ass</u> (dual?)
2. Thou - <u>ám</u> , <u>hám</u>	2. You (familiar form) <u>am-il</u> and <u>am-ass</u> (dual?)
3. This one - <u>tój</u>	3. Those ones <u>toj-ess</u> .

I also have come upon inat, inená and innamáss as plural first person pronouns.

b. Pronominal Particles

192
193

These particles are prefixed to nouns and verbs in every case where the state or action refers to persons; which is why they are so frequently encountered, to the extent that in a dialogue there is hardly a word to which they are not affixed. This phenomenon, added to the elision to which their vowels fall heir when brought into contact with the vowels of the words which they precede, often produces the illusion that they are part of the root of those words.

These particles are as follows in singular and plural, for nouns and verbs:

1st My (singular object), My (plural object), Our (singular object) Our (plural object), I and Us: no, nu, ni, na.

2nd Thy (singular object), Thy (plural object), Your (familiar plural form with singular object), Your (familiar plural form with plural object), Thou and You (objective) -- a, ha.

3rd Of his, of theirs, that one, those ones -- lo, lu, le.

In addition to these particles of relation they customarily use others which are also prefixed to a given word root and which give the absolute or general meaning to the expression. The particles are more frequently t and l, and often la. For example: "flame of fire" is itoj-cuáca; "flame" (in general) is la-cuáca; "hut door" is huet-pé, while "door" (in general) is la-pé or hla-pé.

c. Demonstrative Pronouns

Singular

Plural

This one -- Toj
and Toj-tzi,
Toj-chi
and Toj-quí.

These ones -- Toj ess
and Toj-ess-tzi,
Toj-ess-chi
and Toj-ess-quí.

That one yonder -- Toj-licné

These ones yonder -- Toj-ess-licné

That one -- Toj-láni and
Toj-léc-ti

Those ones -- Toj-ess

In combination, toj or toj-ess precede and tzi', etc., licné, laní etc., follow the word or phrase. 192
193

d. Interrogative Pronouns

Who? -- adhéj or âdéj.

What? -- atde or hat dezu. [260]

e. Reflexive Pronouns

J-lam -- suffixed -- meaning "same," (the Latin met) is used as personal pronoun and is the root element in the adverbs j-lam-mej, which means "always."

Chapter XII

Regarding Verbs

a. General Observations

The verbs are the really difficult elements in this language to nail down. I confess my ignorance; I cannot even point out an infinitive, an infinitive that is, which I can be absolutely sure is an infinitive. It might be, if I had sufficient time, that I could get to the bottom of the problem but I just do not have enough time to work on it at present. I must add, however, in defense of my good name, that the fault does not lie entirely with my limited intelligence but rather is in greater part due to the many intricacies of this wretched language and to the absolute lack of even the vaguest idea of grammatical forms on the part of my Indian interpreters. When, for example, one asks them how to say "to eat," they are at a loss for an answer, or else give a different answer every time they are confronted with the question. One must ask them how to say "I want to eat," and then "let's eat" and in this way lead them gently to the basic question. And then one comes up against a solid wall.

for "to eat" together with "to want" is expressed by a special form which includes both ideas. And so it goes.

And then there are the different forms and ways of saying things. For instance, Spanish for yo tengo ("I have") reproduces the French c'et a moi and the Latin id est mihi, and one must run the risk of saying that es ("is") means tengo ("have"). Well, it seems that these Indians have some of these idiomatic expressions too.

And what will the reader think if I say that I have not even been able to discover the plural of verbs? There is a particle en or hen, according to the ending of the word which precedes it, which undoubtedly expresses plurality, but I do not know whether it is a pronominal particle or rather a real verbal inflection. For example: "dance" [singular, imperative--Translator] is catin and "dance" [plural, imperative--Translator] is catinén. So far so good, but let us look further -- "let us dance" is inát-catin, in which the en has become lost and inát meaning "we," has appeared, but in an analogous case this does not happen at all -- for instance: "touch" [singular, imperative--Translator] is hen quíé, while "let us touch," is inénhequíén, in which there are a number of changes for reason of euphony and pronunciation ease [261] but among which there can easily be distinguished, in the background, the en which had disappeared in "let us dance." This, in itself, would not be a serious problem for it might mean only that there were two plural forms. The real trouble lies in that if we combine the example with subject and object we notice that hen or en agrees with the object and not with the subject, the verb never taking on a passive or neuter quality as happens with certain Latin verbs such as videor, loquor, etc.

For example: "kill [imperative, singular--Translator] the sheep (sing.)" is l-lón tzonatáj; "Peter has killed the sheep (sing.)" is Peiló ilón tzonataj; "Peter has killed the sheep (plural) is Peiló ilonén tzonatáss. Where now is the rule which required the particle en in "dance" (imperative, plural), "let us dance," etc.? This type of confusion crops up dozens of times.

Another confusing example: iloje means to cure; iil means "the sick (one)" but in order to render "the Indians are curing the sick" into the Mataco language one must say uicquei ilojeje tojiil-nen. Where does the "rule of incorporation" begin and where does it end in this sentence?

192
193

So all I can say with any certainty is that en and hen are more often than not found in conjunction with plurality. I say more often than not because it is not always so. For example: "The whites have killed a sheep" is Tsiguúele tzonataj. Apparently this plural construction with en is not used with the verb except when the object of the action of that verb is plural, or when the plural subject of the verb is one which receives the verb's action, as for instance in "to dance." This seems to indicate that in the syntax of these verbs there is a great difference when compared to ours. There is possibly a similarity in some chases to English verbal usage -- i. e., "I am told," "We are told" etc., in place of "They have told me," "They have told us," which is analogous, after all to the Latin neuter in videor, etc.

b. Regarding Tenses

To judge from the welter of verb forms which I have before me I think I can give assurance that this language has many conjugations. On this score it would be similar to Guaraní, which also has many, and would be very different from the Araucano language, which has only one, and also from the Quichua which likewise, or so it seems to me, has only one -- though an extremely complicated one in compound tenses.

From all the foregoing the reader will gather that I cannot possibly present one or more types of verb conjugations because I have not been able to describe them. Despite this, however, I am in a position to give some forms for a few of the tenses.

One of the more exact of these is the future, which is expressed by means of the present plus a final syllable la. For example: "he returns" is tapil, while "he will return" is tapil-la. This is what might be called the absolute future, for there is another future which I shall call the dubitative and which is formed with the addition of pbiye, which means "may be," this being added at the end. The la future form is also used to [262] connote duty or obligation to do something, which is also true of our language.

Another form is the past, which consists of adding é to the present form preceded by a repetition of the last letter of the present tense form -- for it is one of this language's idiosyncracies to repeat certain letters, as is done in Italian and so many others, with the

exception of Spanish. Example: "he arrives" is yom, while "he has arrived" is yommé.

The remote past or preterite, however, is formed by placing the adverb of time náji or náje next to the present, the n being replaced by another letter, usually l, if it falls pleasantly on the ear. For example: "he kills" is ilóm, while "he killed" (preterite) is ilonnaje. Sometimes aje alone is added, as for instance: "he eats"--théuccué, "he ate" -- théu quáje.

Another way of forming the immediate past (which almost corresponds to the imperfect) is by adding nenna, which they use either whole or else reduced to one or other of its two syllables according to the speakers personal whim.

These two words náje and nenna are the same ones which are used in the word "yesterday" -- icuala-náje and "today" -- icuala-nenná; (see how logical these savages are), and, as is the case with the future lá, are set off from the verbal element proper in order to allow for the addition of some infix or other, which may even be a whole phrase.

c. Regarding Personal Flections

It would seem, to judge from the above examples, as if the language of these Indians were totally lacking in verbal endings which had anything to do with persons, although they are -- to a certain extent -- related to number by means of the suffix en. However, be it because of a merely casual pronunciation difference, be it intentional and related to the person of the verb, the fact is that I find the e changed to i in the first person of the past tense in the following examples: "I arrived" -- yammi; "I returned" -- tapini; "I ate" (remote past or preterite) -- tdeucquáji. But it happens anyway, that these changes in verbs to agree with the person concerned are not needed for each has a pronominal prefix attached to it, to wit: nu, a, lo, inat, which correspond to "I," "thou," "he," "we," etc., which undergo certain variations such as: no and ni, lu and li, inné, and I don't remember which others.

However, in negative usage, which is formed with the suffix tdé, meaning "no," the word seems to take on a sort of flectional form, but this is to be attributed solely to the desire for euphony. For example: "I see" -- nu huenn; "I do not see" -- nu-huenni tdé, instead of nuhenntdé; "short" is isset or nisset while "not short" is

nu yissti tdé, rather than nuissetde; "is he dead?" is yáj iil?, and "he is not dead" is yini tde, instead of yill tdé. 192
193

I do not go into further details because I would continually find it necessary to become embroiled in forms about which very little is known as to their differentiations -- and these variations become all the more numerous as the [263] relations which are treated become more complex. Let us take a single example, and that from among the more elementary ones. "Did the Chief (mine) return?" is Yaj tapil-le nucauniá?; "He did not return" -- Tapini-tdé. In this very simple example, why do we have in one instance le, and in the other ni? The interrogative is concerned only with the first part, that is, with yaj. In my opinion it is quite clear that these changes are the result of an aural whim, and I believe that I can almost say that tapil-le is a substitution caused by the nu which follows tapilné, which is in turn a syncopation of tapil-nenná; and so also with tapi ni. Now ab uno disce omnes.

d. Regarding Reflexive Verbs

They seem to form some reflexive verbs by juxtaposing j-lam to the active form. For example: "Pedro killed himself" is Peiló tilonne j-lam. This j-lam translates the Latin met and our own "--self." So the personal pronoun nojlam could be "ego met," that is, "I myself," which would cause it to harmonize more closely with the other pronominal elements. I must make clear here that my references, both here and elsewhere, to Latin are not efforts to establish any sort of analogy whatsoever -- I only do so in an effort to make my report more clear.

e. Regarding Verbs in General

It is worthwhile noting how certain verbs whose meaning has become modified keep to their original root. For example: "to walk" is opil, "to return" is tapil; "to come" is nom, "to arrive" is yom; "to die" is iil, "to kill" is ilón; "to shout, call out, say" is ohn, to speak hon and hon-quei (that is "to speak with") corresponds to our "to converse," which is one more proof, in my opinion,

of the Indians' quick wit and logical inclination. These expressions could give us the key to the modifying value of certain particles, from which much would be gained regarding the philosophy of language (as in hon-quié) and comparative philology, as in ta-pil, in which t represents repetition of an action -- as retracing one's steps does indeed imply -- and which is found with this meaning in the Araucano language, and, for that matter in ours also as for instance agitar [meaning "to shake" or "agitate"--Translator] from agere, and the Italian seguitare ["To follow"--Translator] which is seguir in Spanish; and there are dozens of other examples.

However, it is by means of postpositions that the vast majority of verbs are formed. We have already given the examples tol-l-ca, "to come from"; tol-l-pe, "to fall from," tol-l-equite "to fall into," all of which are derived from tol-l, a word of movement. And I am positive that, according to this rule, if I were to say toll-que (que is the same as cum -- "with," as in "company") in place of "to accompany" or "to go with," these Indians would understand me. Further examples? "Peter is dying of hunger" is Peilo il-lej nainló (ej means "with" in an instrumental sense). And in order to [264] convince the reader that ej in this case is not a preposition of nainló, "hunger," let us see the following example: "The Indians are dying of hunger" is Uicquii yil ej-i-én nainló, that is yille-ej-én, in which ej precedes en, a suffix of the plural verb which is, naturally, attached and suffixed to the latter and not prefixed to the noun. It is therefore not a "preposition" as we shall call it when we study this part of speech.

This type of preposition usage, together with the other changes and variations of which we have so often complained, is not the least of the causes which make for confusion and difficulty in the study of verbs. And in actual fact, what activities can escape the possibility of being expressed by a verb which covers the basic idea and a postpositional particle which assigns a relation to it? Very few indeed. And very few also are the words which do not have one or other of these disguised insertions which crop up now here, now there, now somewhere else and in a different guise, according to the aural requirements of the moment, and which flabbergast the hearer and surprise and confuse him with their inexplicable changes and variations.

One of the verbal forms for expressing actions which include the idea of possession is that of placing ya next to the word which

expresses the thing possessed. For example: "woman" is chiecua, "to have a woman (or wife)" is chiecuaya; "fear" is huái, "to be afraid (to have a fear)" is huáya. Another way of indicating possession is as follows: "son" is loss, while "to have sons" is lo lessen; "daughter" is either lo-se or le-ctza, and "to have daughters" is lolessás; "brother" is quiilaj, and "to have brothers" is quiilaliss.

The verb "to be" is not expressed. For example: "I am ugly" is nu-tzi-tde, which literally means "I goodlooking not."

d. Examples of Verbal Flections

I shall put an end to this very boring matter of the verbs (it has been so for me, I must confess, although I hope it has not for the reader!) by attempting to put together and set down one of the verb conjugations for the indicative mood. I do not guarantee the details -- you already know why -- but I believe that in general it may be accepted as summing up what I know on the subject.

VERB: ilon -- "to kill."

INDICATIVE MOOD

Present Tense

- Singular: 1. I kill -- nu-ilón
 2. Thou killest -- há-ilon
 3. He kills -- l-ilón

Remote Past (Preterite)

1. I killed -- nu-ilon-náje
 2. Thou killedest -- ha-ilon-náje
 3. He killed -- l-ilon-náje
 or t-ilon-náje

[265]

Plural:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. We kill -- <u>inat-ilón-én</u> | 1. We killed -- <u>inat-ilonnajién</u> |
| 2. You kill -- <u>há-ilon-en</u> | 2. You killed -- <u>ha-ilonnajién</u> |
| 3. They kill -- <u>tojéss-ilon-én</u> | 3. They killed -- <u>tojéss-ilonnajién</u> |

192
193

IMPERFECT TENSE

- Singular: 1. I was killing -- nu-ilonnénna
 2. Thou wert killing -- ha-ilonnénna
 3. He was killing -- 1-ilonnénna
- Plural: 1. We were killing -- inat-ilonnénnahén
 2. You were killing -- ha-ilonnénnahén
 3. They were killing -- tojéss-ilonnénnahén.

PAST PERFECT

- Singular: 1. I have killed -- nu-ilonné
 2. Thou hast killed -- ha-ilonné
 3. He has killed -- 1e-ilonné
- Plural: 1. We have killed -- inat-ilonnehén
 2. You have killed -- ha-ilonnehén
 3. They have killed -- tojéss-ilonnehén

FUTURE

- Singular: 1. I shall kill -- nu-ilón-lá
 2. Thou wilt kill -- ha-ilón-lá
 3. He will kill -- 1-ilón-lá
- Plural: 1. We shall kill -- inat-ilon-lá-hen
 2. You will kill -- ha-ilon-lá-hen
 3. They will kill -- tojéss-ilon-lá-hen.

IMPERATIVE

kill - 1-lon.

Let it be understood that the preterite form with náje is used only very rarely, and even less so is the nenná form used.

Do these people have a passive form to their verbs? I don't know. Yet I have noticed that many of the constructions using the passive in the Romance languages are changed about by them

192 ●
193

and rendered into an active form, or at least an intransitive one.

For example: instead of saying "Paul was killed by Pliny," they say "Pliny died because of Paul [sic]" or else "Pliny killed Paul."

I don't think, really, that this necessarily points up an inferiority in their language.

By no means let it be thought that the verbs in this language are easy and simple by virtue of the above conjugation table. It is, in fact, just because they are so jumbled and involved that I am not able to give further moods or tenses, which are so terribly complicated that even now I do not have a firm grasp of their governing rules.

Chapter XIII

Regarding Adverbs

There are a great many adverbs, but those involving time stand out because of the logical manner of their formation which parallels the way in which we form them in our own language. For example: "day" is icuála, which actually means "sun" or "one sun," just as "month" is igüeláj, which literally means "moon"; "beside" [266] is tem-ló; náje, náji or naj mean "past," and also "afterward," in the sense of past time; nenna and na mean "present, now" -- so (quite logically) "today" is icuálanna, that is "present sun"; Spanish manana is icuála and also quicuála, in the same way that in Spanish manana means both "morning" and "tomorrow"; "yesterday" is icuálannaje, that is "the past sun"; "the day before yesterday" is icuála el-láje, which means -- since el means "other" and láje is the same as náje -- "the other past sun." Because of some change or harmonious feeling or custom in the language, "the day after tomorrow" is tem-lo icuála, which signifies "beside tomorrow." It is curious that tem-ló is prefixed to icuála to express the idea of a day later and yet náje is suffixed when expressing the idea of a day earlier. Quirks of the language apparently, and yet they must answer to some etymological, not to say philosophical, reason, which resides in their changed position.

192
805

What further attracts my attention is the following: Instead of our "night" they use a word which means "earth," that is, hunát hunná, just as for "day" they make use of their word for "sun," as if they had intended to oppose one to the other. It may not be too farfetched to see in this a sort of philosophy in which the earth and the sun represent two opposite principles: darkness and light, good and evil. I, however, have not been able to perceive any such philosophy in their ideology, although it is true that something of this sort -- somewhat materialized -- is to be found in their religion, as we have had occasion to see in an earlier section of this treatise.

And is this business of using the sun, or light, to express the idea of time not an intellectual parallel or approach to the Aryan, for from the Sanscrit dyu, that is "light" [Spanish luz--Translator] came the Latin dies, the Spanish día, and the Italian di, all of which mean "day" or "day's effort."

Meanwhile, in order to say "this afternoon" they say hunná and quía-hunná, and for "last night," hunná-tzi-nná, keeping thus to the same form and sequence followed in the order of words which we saw in "today," "tomorrow," etc.

Furthermore, their expression for "sky" is ppe-lé, which must be translated as "that which is above," from ppé, "above" and lé which is a contraction of lél-lé or c-lél-lé, a patronimic word which is used to express the concept of origin, provenience, fatherland, etc.

It is said that savages have no abstract ideas, but I ask, is the idea of "always" or "never" abstract or not? Without waiting for an answer I say that these Indians in question have the word inne-mid which expresses "never," and c-lam-mej for "always," which they derive, respectively, from innem -- "more" (Italian mai, Latin umquam) and the negative d; and from j-lam, meaning "same" plus the postposition ej.

It may be objected these are expressions made up of words which separately mean something more limited, which is valid as far as the objection goes. The French, let it be remembered [267] say toujours, "all the days," with the meaning of "always" and thus express an idea which is indefinite, or rather infinite, by means of a word which of itself has a limited meaning as is the case with "day." The fact of the matter is that a given abstraction is not

limited to the words used to convey it but hinges rather on the intention behind it. If this were not so what could one say in defense of the English word "always"? P2
196

While we are on this subject let me mention that the particles naje and nenná -- the latter sometimes missing its first syllable, sometimes its last and shifting from i to e [sic] -- are used to make two verb tenses. The first, that is naje, being employed for the remote past or preterite and the other for the past perfect. For example: "to return" is tapil; "he returned" is tapil láje; "he has returned" is tapil-lé (the second l in both cases is the same as n, as was explained above in the treatment of icuála-el-láje). 192
196
805

In place of "midday" or "noon" they say icuála icni, which, as far as I can make out means "high sun" or "up above sun"; and in order to convey the idea of "midnight" they say hunnat-quiú-nej, which I take to mean "low earth" or "underneath earth." For "it is early" they say inataj; and for "it is late," hunáj.

They have a syllable, tde, or dthé, or ntdé, which is the basic element for a great number of adverbs of place and of time. For example: "why?" is atdyécque; "where?" is tdené; "whence?" is dtel che; "how?" is atde-tzú; "how much?" is tde-hoté; "when?" is tde-naj-hote. Hoté alone means "as," and naj expresses the further meaning that the question refers to a somewhat remote period in the past. Let it be noted that wherever a precedes it usually refers to "thou," since the question is asked of a second person. This goes to show how important it is to know the circumstances of time (tense) and person to which the questions refer, when writing the answers.

I am afraid that I shall bore the reader with this mass of data on the Mataco language, and yet I do not know, for the life of me how to keep from telling that little which I have been able to learn of it and gather in the limited free time allowed me by my professional work and which usually comes only in the very late hours of the night. If I make digressions to keep the reader from becoming tired I fear that I shall write too lengthily, and if I make no digressions and write a straight report I fear to be too dry and boring. . . . Certainly I know not which way to turn. Who will suggest some bright idea which will afford escape from this slough? No one? JTB

can easily imagine then the horrible confusion confronting the neophyte who is faced with a pile of expressions belonging to a completely new and strange language in which a given word seems to change and be different every time it is used, and for no apparent reason. I for my part confess that for a long time I was unable to understand it and even now I own that I have been able to track down only very few of the rules which govern these changes and which lie hidden among the hundreds of sentences which I have written down. 193

For example: cue is equivalent to "with"; "we" is, in its abbreviated form nu hén; "with us" is nu cue hén. 192 ● 193

Of course, the problem would not be difficult if one could ask an Indian a question regarding an isolated word and he were able to answer in an absolute way. But the Indian, more times than not, has need always to refer the word to some thing. Thus, when one asks him how one says "foot" in his language he will answer nuccoló if he touches his own foot; accolo if he touches the questioner's foot; tocolo if he touches the foot of some third person. Then there is the confusing problem of [269] different construction. For example: in the above mentioned case of nuccuenen, if one asks the interpreter which is the part which means "with" and which the part corresponding to "us" he will answer (if he is intelligent and knows the language) quite naively: nuc means "with," and cuehen is "us" -- precisely the opposite to what is actually the case.

So it is that there is nothing for it but to go forward slowly and step by step, from the known to the unknown, inquiring first after single words, then after simple, clear sentences, then after less simple but still clear ones, and finally, by dint of repeating the same sentence with slight changes of one word or some one of its parts we shall in all probability, manage, by a simple process of elimination, to arrive at the meaning of each word. And yet even this is not enough for, owing to the properties inherent in this language which I have pointed out elsewhere, owing to the great intellectual distance between the interlocutors, and to the different points of view to which they hold because of mutual ignorance, the wretched student suddenly finds himself face to face with an old word in a new disguise, not knowing why or how or when the change came about and wondering which of the two forms is the

correct or original or basic one. His first reaction is to redouble his efforts and multiply his questions, and thus very often he only redoubles his confusion until he finally ends up by producing a veritable Babel. . . .

And since we have mentioned Babel, I must remark that the Vielas [sic] Indians translate the word "speak" by the term mbabelon.

But now let us return to our prepositions. It is often said that these prepositions modify the meaning of verbs, but it would be closer to the truth to say that they merely complement them. For example: Tol-l carries with it the idea of movement. When used alone it may mean "to sprout": thus "the grass sprouts" is expressed thus: "grass, tol-l. With the addition of ca at the end it means "to come from," and if ppé is added it means "to fall." Other words are not lacking which express the same thing, however if we want to use tol-l then these particles, which are used as postpositions, must be placed next to the nouns.

It might be supposed, when these prepositions are suffixed to verbs, that they are really prefixes of the objective case; but in spite of the fact that there are some prepositions which are prepositions in every sense of the word, nevertheless, in the above cases they act postpositionally even with verbs, because they modify the latter's endings in accord with their sound, because the verbs thus modified can be used alone -- for other words can be inserted between it (together with its postposition) and the objective case -- which demonstrates that the postposition is attached to the verb.

The main particles, or at least the one which I judge to be so, and which act as do our prepositions are: eckia -- "until"; tammenej -- "because of"; appé, pé or ppé -- "on top of"; (h)icquio -- "below"; cue, quie, ycque, ecque, ej -- "with" (these are probably one and the same, but modified for reasons of euphony); uuith, uuitd and c-loya, which also [270] mean "with" and are prefixed and are rather to be considered copulative conjunctions; op, ob, "hot," hlot -- "for," and which I have only come across with the meaning of "because," for example: op-toj -- "because" ("for this"); op-qui-la -- "what for?", while in order to say "why?" they use atddeyéque which is made up of atde meaning "what" or "how" and yécque -- "with." There is also the postposition ei which is

like the Italian da and the French chez, and is used for movement to or from a place (the latter often being omitted) and is placed in diverse positions. This ei or iei is part of a most elegant verbal expression: miei, meaning "fetch," composed of móh or mmóh which means "go" and ei (the whole having undergone one of the numerous shifts which are so common to this language and used to drive me to desperation). For example: Instead of saying "go and bring me fire" (itoj) they say miéi-itoj, which is "fetch me fire." At first, and even after I had been working on the language for some time, I thought it was a flection.

Another important postposition is ca which means "of" (genitive and ablative) and is suffixed to both verbs and nouns. With these latter it forms a sort of genitive which I find is used somewhat rarely and then only with proper nouns. With personal pronouns it forms the possessives "my," "thy," "his," which in this tongue are genitive -- if they can be called such -- and follow the same rule as genitives do in Italian in which one may just as readily say "mine" as "of me." So from nu (which is a syncopated form of nojlam -- "I") they derive nujcá -- "my"; ah-ca -- "your," luh-cá -- "his," "of him."

There are other postpositions also: cquí, "within"; lája, which means "without" and is a prefix, and which is a word of negation, for I do not find it prefixed to any words other than those ending in a way which indicates denied possession. For instance, "wifeless" is lája chequó yá, that is "not married."

There are so many others that I cannot possibly recall them all.

The words that express our "with" (ecq, yc-que) lead me to believe that some postpositions govern certain cases and that the varied endings of the latter cause the apparent change in the prefix. For example, "me" is nuya; "with me" is nuyécque -- from which one can easily conclude that a shift has taken place from nuya yécque. And does not the same thing happen in Italian when instead of saying con lo, con la, con li, we say col-lo, col-la, col-li, and in place of di-lo, di-la we say del-lo, del-la?

suffixing of artificial particles in the interrogative: chu at the end of verbs, and taj at the end of nouns.

For example: "Do you want?" is munanqui? and "water" (accusative) is yacuta. If one were to ask: "Do you want water?", this would be munanquichu yacuta?; "you are called" is sutiqui, and "how" is ima. In order to ask "How (what) are you called?" one must say imataj sutiqui, one sound -- if spoken -- or calligraphic symbol -- if written -- being economized.

Let it be noted that in Quichua all particles are suffixed, be they conjunctions, prepositions, interrogatives, declensions. This makes of it an exceptionally [sic] typical language.

Chapter XV

Regarding Conjunctions

192
193

I have not found a single disjunctive conjunction such as "or," "neither," etc. Instead of "or" they appear to use "if not," and in place of "neither" they seem to repeat the verb. For example, they say "Give me water if there is no wine" instead of "give me [273] water or wine." And also: "I have no water, I have no wine" instead of "I have neither water nor wine."

Conversely, they have many words to express copulative conjunctions such as "and," "also," etc., all of which they prefix, as we do. The more important of this type of conjunction are, it seems to me: uuth or uutd and c-loya which they use for our "with," as has already been seen, and utcuei, isiquiei, tdéui, which correspond to our [blank left here, but probably "and" was intended--Translator].

I notice that tdéui is used especially in interrogative phrases such as: "I am leaving, and you?" -- Nu-ycque, tdeui am? They have the conditional conjunction "if," which is quia or cquia. When a conditional proposition is placed before the main proposition, the latter is joined to uutd, just as so is used after wenn in German, or cosi in Italian. For example: "If you do not want to, let me know" is cquia ("you do not want to") uutd ("let me know").